

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5, 8, 15-22, 29-43, and 50-64 are currently pending. Claims 23-28 and 44-49 have been canceled without prejudice; and Claims 1, 2, 4, 8, 15, 16, 19, 22, 29-31, 33, 35, 37, 38, 40, 43, 50-52, 54, 56, 58, 59, 61, and 64 have been amended by the present amendment. The changes to the claims are supported by the originally filed specification and do not add new matter.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1, 3-5, 8, 15, 16, 18-30, 32-37, 39-51, 53-58, and 60-64 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,987,126 to Okuyama et al. (hereinafter “the ‘126 patent”); and Claims 2, 17, 31, 38, 52, and 59 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the ‘126 patent in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,298,196 to Shima et al. (hereinafter “the ‘196 patent”).

Amended Claim 1 is directed to an information processing apparatus, comprising: (1) an extractor configured to extract main information including copy control information and to extract auxiliary information representing attributes of the main information from input information; (2) a generator configured to generate copy permission information based on the extracted auxiliary information; and (3) a recorder configured to record the main information, and to record the copy permission information generated by the generator in at least one header adjacent to a corresponding portion of the main information. The changes to Claim 1 are supported by the originally filed specification and do not add new matter.

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claim 1 is rendered moot by the present amendment to that claim.

The ‘126 patent is directed to a device having a digital interface that includes a first detector that detects, from data in a predetermined data format, copy generation management

information; and a first interface that converts the data in the predetermined format to data into a data format of a network bus, and inserts the copy generation management information into the data format corresponding to the data format of the network bus after the format conversion. As shown in Figure 4, the ‘126 patent discloses that a copy generation managing circuit 44 is designed “to insert the copy generation management information based on the detection result of the copy flag detector 42 to the position corresponding to the format after conversion when the format converting circuit 43 executes any format conversion.”¹ Further, the ‘126 patent discloses that, as an example, when the recording format conforms to the D-interface format, the copying generation management circuit 44 inserts the copy generation management information to the CGMS area of the source control pack when the data from the device 22 is recorded.

However, Applicants respectfully submit that the ‘126 patent fails to disclose a recorder configured to record the main information, and to record the copy permission information generated by the generator in at least one header adjacent to a corresponding portion of the main information, as recited in amended Claim 1. The ‘126 patent does not disclose that copy permission information is recorded in at least one header adjacent to a corresponding portion of the main information, as recited in Claim 1. Rather, the ‘126 patent merely discloses that the detected copy generation management information is inserted into the payload at a position that depends on the format, after the format has been converted using the format converting circuit 43. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claim 1 (and all similarly rejected dependent claims) patentably defines over the ‘126 patent.

Independent Claims 8, 29, 35, 50, and 56 recite limitations analogous to the limitations recited in Claim 1. Moreover, Claims 8, 29, 35, 50, and 56 have been amended in a manner analogous to the amendment to Claim 1. Accordingly, for reasons analogous to the

¹ ‘126 patent, column 14, lines 24-29.

reasons stated above for the patentability of Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of Claims 8, 29, 35, 50, and 56 (and all similarly rejected dependent claims) are rendered moot by the present amendment to the independent claims.

Regarding to rejections of dependent Claims 2, 17, 31, 38, 52, and 56 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), Applicants respectfully submit that the '196 patent fails to remedy the deficiencies of the '126 patent, as discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of the above-noted dependent claims are rendered moot by the present amendment to the independent claims.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 1, 8, 29, 35, 50, and 56 (and all associated dependent claims) patentably define over any proper combination of the '126 and '196 patents.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above discussion, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The application as amended herewith is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073
Kurt M. Berger, Ph.D.
Registration No. 51,461

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 03/06)